

REMARKS

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-4, 6-13, 15-20 and 22-24 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-4, 6-13, 15-20 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reilly et al. (US PG Pub. 2002/0026349 A1) further in view of Theimer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,493,692).

The claims are amended, and, thus, the pending claims remain for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested. No new matter has been added.

REJECTIONS

The independent claims are 1, 11 and 20, which are amended taking into consideration the Examiner comments noted in the Office Action page 9, item 9, to place the application in condition for allowance. In contrast to Reilly and Theimer, the claimed embodiment of the invention provides:

a summarization processing part, ... obtaining from the distribution rank storage part a distribution rank previously selected by the receiver of the stored distribution information and selected based on its correspondence to the sender of the distribution information, conducting summarization processing of the distribution information ... in accordance with designation of a summarization degree corresponding to the distribution rank obtained ...;

an image information generating part adding, to each distribution information, screen definition information of a rank setting screen allowing a receiver to input the distribution rank by selection, or access information to the rank setting screen to each ~~distribution information~~; and

a distribution rank updating part updating the distribution rank stored in the distribution rank storage part, based on an input distribution rank which a receiver inputs by selection on the rank setting screen regarding the distribution information upon receiving the distribution information,

wherein the summarizing of the distribution information further comprises extracting at least a portion of the distribution information according to the distribution rank.

The Office Action maintains: "Reilly teaches the selection and rank setting using a user interface in which the user inputs topical categories and keywords as parameters in rank ordering (see fig 5). The summarization degree is defined in fig 6 and its respective description. Therefore, Reilly still meets the scope of the limitations as currently claimed."

However, FIG. 5 of Reilly and the description thereof indicated by the Examiner disclose a screen for allowing a user to select a favorite subcategory regarding a certain category. On the other hand, the language of the claims as amended for clarity provides "adding, to each distribution information, screen definition information of a rank setting screen allowing a receiver to input the distribution rank by selection, or access information to the rank setting screen." At this time, the distribution information is subjected to a summarization based upon designation of a summarization degree corresponding to a distribution rank previously stored in a distribution rank storage part, and the processing result is sent to the receiver, namely the language of the claims provide "a summarization processing part, ... obtaining ... a distribution rank previously selected by the receiver ... and selected based on its correspondence to the sender of the distribution information, ***conducting summarization ... in accordance with designation of a summarization degree corresponding to the distribution rank obtained.***"

Thus, a benefit is that when the receiver receives the distribution information and would like to change the summarization degree thereof, the receiver can display the rank setting screen based on the screen definition information or the access information added to the distribution information, and input a distribution rank by selection on the displayed rank setting screen. Then, the distribution rank which the receiver has input by selection is updated and registered in the distribution rank storage part, a benefit is that when information is distributed next time, the summarization of distribution information is conducted in accordance with the summarization degree corresponding to the updated distribution rank. Therefore, a benefit is that when the receiver receives distribution information, the receiver can easily alter a summarization degree, and when information is distributed next time, information is distributed in accordance with the altered summarization degree.

In contrast, Reilly fails to disclose expressly or implicitly that definition information or access information is added to distribution information, regarding the subcategory selection screen in FIG. 5. Furthermore, Reilly is silent on any relationship between the selection of the subcategory (FIG. 5) and the alleged FIG. 6 summarization degree, because in Reilly, a headline

is displayed in a screen saver mode, as disclosed in FIG. 6 and [0073]. Then, as disclosed in FIG. 10 and [0093], when a screen saver is cancelled, a full version of information in which the head line has been shown in the screen saver is displayed in a center section 248 of a screen. That is, in Reilly, the summarization degree of distribution information is altered in accordance with the display mode of a screen, instead of the selection of a user, namely “**conducting summarization ... in accordance with designation of a summarization degree corresponding to the distribution rank obtained.**” The Office Action alleges Reilly’s user categorization can be similar to the claimed user ranking, however, Reilly fails to disclose expressly or implicitly any summarization based upon any user categorization.

Furthermore, according to the invention of the present application, summarization processing is conducted when a request for distribution of information is received. On the other hand, in Reilly, it is not certain when summarization processing is conducted, and Reilly at least does not describe that summarization processing is conducted when a request for distribution of information is received. And the claims are amended taking into consideration the Examiner comments for placing the application into condition for allowance, namely “wherein the summarizing of the distribution information further comprises extracting at least a portion of the distribution information according to the distribution rank.” Reilly is silent on this limitation.

Theimer is relied upon for allegedly discussing the claimed ranking. Theimer column 4, lines 33-43, merely discusses “determines a display property for said electronic message based on the contextual attributes,” however a “display property” differs from the claimed summarization of information based upon ranking, namely “**conducting summarization ... in accordance with designation of a summarization degree corresponding to the distribution rank obtained.**” Theimer column 25, lines 27-45, FIG. 14, step 432, discusses “The step in box 432 evaluates the message based on the context of the recipient and the priority of the message, and may determine a display property which indicates how a message should be delivered, if at all.” Also, Theimer Abstract discusses “The display property may designate immediate delivery on a particular display device, a notification on a particular display device, or storage of the message until the contextual attributes of the recipient user is consistent with the specified contextual attributes of the electronic message.” So in Theimer, the display property relates to how a message is delivered, rather than how to perform a “**summarization**” of information to be distributed.

A prima facie case of obviousness base upon Reilly and Theimer cannot be established, because there is no evidence expressly or implicitly that one skilled in the art would combine Theimer's display property, which is how a message should be delivered, with Reilly's information categorization, and then further modify both Theimer and Reilly to provide the claimed "***conducting summarization ... in accordance with designation of a summarization degree corresponding to the distribution rank obtained*** and "***wherein the summarizing of the distribution information further comprises extracting at least a portion of the distribution information according to the distribution rank.***"

Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims is requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

/Mehdi D. Sheikerz/

Date: _____ July 1, 2008 _____

By: _____
Mehdi D. Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501